

Section 8. Human resources as the denominator of management development

UDC 331.08

Alexis Quiroz Mora,

student of Master degree program

“HR-management in international organization”,

Ural Federal University, Yekaterinburg, Russia,

Puebla University, Puebla, Mexico

INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MEXICO: FROM MOTIVATIONS TO OBLIGATIONS

Abstract. There is a growing importance of the process of internationalization of higher education (IoHE). This paper aims to look into the process of IoHE in Mexican institutions particularly looking into their developments, the importance placed on it, and its relation to globalized trends in educational institutions. The paper shows how the process of IoHE is a consequence of globalization and has become a new obligation of educational institutions by putting a premium in producing global citizens aware of global issues and competent enough to compete in the growing global job market.

Keywords: globalization, internationalization of higher education, Mexico, motivation, mobilization

УДК 331.08

Алексис Кироз Мора,

студент магистратуры Уральского федерального университета,

Екатеринбург, Россия,

студент университета Пуэбла, Пуэбла, Мексика

ИНТЕРНАЦИОНАЛИЗАЦИЯ ВЫСШЕГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ В МЕКСИКЕ: ОТ МОТИВАЦИИ К ОБЯЗАТЕЛЬСТВАМ

Аннотация. Важность процесса интернационализации высшего образования (ИВО) возрастает. Цель этой статьи – взглянуть на процесс ИВО в Мексике, в частности, на институциональное развитие, его значение в контексте глобальных трендов образовательных институтов. Статья показывает, как процесс ИВО, будучи следствием глобализации, превратился в новое обязательство для образовательных институтов посредством достижения производства глобальных граждан, осознающих глобальные вызовы и вполне конкурентных на растущем глобальном рынке труда.

Ключевые слова: глобализация, интернационализация высшего образования, Мексика, мотивация, мобилизация

Introduction

“Internationalization of higher education is a key objective of governments and higher education institutions throughout the world” (Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 585). According to the International Association of Universities (IAU)’s 4th Global Survey reports entitled *Internationalization of Higher Education: Growing expectations, fundamental values* published on the 1st of April 2014, “institutions worldwide are focusing on internationalization” (International Association of Universities [IAU], 2014). With over half of the respondents claiming the presence of internationalization policies or strategies in their institution, twenty-two percent stating that one is in preparation, and over fifteen percent

indicating that internationalization forms part of the overall institutional strategies, the report claims that student mobility and international research collaboration are the highest-priority internationalization activities within the institutions (IAU, 2014). These institutions claim that “student knowledge of international issues is the most significant expected benefit of internationalization,” which was the same findings in the 3rd and 2nd Global Survey in 2009 and 2005 respectively (IAU, 2014). However, the report also found out that the most significant potential risk of internationalization for institutions was that international opportunities are being available only to students with financial resources (IAU, 2014). “Limited funding is the major internal and external obstacle to advancing internationalization,” which was also found true in the two previous mentioned IAU Global Surveys (IAU, 2014).

Globalization of economies and societies and the increased importance of knowledge have influenced the internationalization of higher education (Egron-Polak, de Wit, Howard, & Hunter, 2015, p. 27). “While it expects mobility and cross-border delivery to continue to grow, it calls for a stronger focus on the curriculum and learning outcomes to ensure internationalization for all, and not just for the mobile few” (Egron-Polak, de Wit, Howard, & Hunter, 2015, p. 28). In a Delphi Panel exercise conducted, a study on the internationalization of higher education for the European Parliament revised Jane Knight’s commonly accepted working definition for internationalization as ‘the intentional process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of post-secondary education, in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to society’ (Egron-Polak, de Wit, Howard, & Hunter, 2015, p. 29). This definition entails a more inclusive and less elitist one by moving beyond student mobility and focusing on the curriculum and learning outcomes in such a way that “internationalization is not a goal in itself, but a means to enhance quality, and that it should not focus solely on economic rationales” (Egron-Polak, de Wit, Howard, & Hunter, 2015, p. 29).

The IAU survey showed an increased in importance of internationalization globally in the previous three years; however, the process and the motivations for doing so varied considerably between regions and countries with only fifty-one percent of institutions in Latin America assigned a level of high importance of internationalization compared to Europe’s seventy-one percent and North America’s sixty-eight percent (Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 585). Working within the framework of Jane Knight’s commonly accepted working definition for IoHE, this paper’s objectives are three-fold and focused on the internationalization of higher education (IoHE) in Mexico. First, this paper aims to give an overview of the internationalization of higher education in Mexico. Second, this paper aims to examine the importance of IoHE in both public and private universities in Mexico by relying on the data collected by Caroline Berry and John Taylor in their article, *Internationalization in higher education in Latin America: Policies and Practice in Colombia and Mexico*. Lastly, this paper aims to investigate whether the process of IoHE has become mandatory to educational institutions in Mexico due to the demands of globalization.

Overview of IoHE in Mexico

Even though internationalization lies at the heart of higher education in Latin America being established by the Spanish and Portuguese in the process of colonization, internationalization in higher education is widely believed to be a relatively underdeveloped concept in Latin America today (Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 585). In a report by Gacel-Ávila in 2007, he concluded that “a lack of coordinated policies and strategies at national and institutional level meant that activities were reactive and unlikely to have a long-term benefit” (cited in Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 585). Another research by “Didou Aupetit has also emphasized that internationalization in the region is often uncoordinated and unplanned and

“even where established student mobility programs exist, only a minority benefit from such schemes as a result of mediocre governance, protectionism, poor foreign language skills and a lack of connection with national policy” (cited in Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 587).

Gacel-Ávila stated in his report that “Mexican institutions were pursuing internationalization strategies in order to improve quality, prepare students for a globalized job market and increase revenue” (cited in Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 588). It has been commented by Cantwell and Maldonado-Maldonado in their work that “even in high-profile institutions, internationalization could be interpreted only to mean the development of students’ and academics’ English language skills (cited in Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 588). Despite of these motivations, it has been noted that a substantial numbers of universities reported that agreements were in place with institutions abroad for student and faculty exchange and for research collaborations, although it was noted that over half of these agreements were inactive (Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 588).

Some obstacles seen in IoHE faced by some Mexican institutions include (1) prestigious foreign universities unlikely to partner with lesser known institutions de to the power held by these elite universities, (2) brain drain seen as the biggest potential risk or negative impact of internationalization, and (3) the lack of leadership in the National Education Plan of 2001, which included an international element (Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 580).

The importance of IoHE in both public and private universities in Mexico

Based in the research conducted by Berry and Taylor through semi-structured interviews with senior staff in six institutions in Mexico and Colombia (Directors of International Offices and Senior Coordinators within International Offices), some key findings on the importance of IoHE in both public and private universities in Mexico. These six institutions are claimed by the research as widely recognized as amongst the leading universities in the country, which allows the assumption that these universities are some of the most active in terms of internationalization.

The one of the aspects that the researched looked into is kind of internationalization activities conducted by the institutions. All institutions both public (MPub1 & MPub2) and private (MPri1) claimed that student mobility (exchanges and/or study abroad) is a very important internationalization activity (see Figure 1). It was the preferred activity for internationalization; however, “most institutions admitted that a relatively low proportion of students were able to participate” and that “even at private universities, the cost of spending a year in the US or Europe was prohibitive for many Latin Americans, and this was even more significant at public institutions” (Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 594).

It was also seen that “for the universities that were fairly new to the process, it seems that mobility was perceived to be a good starting point, perhaps because results could be seen more quickly” (Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 594). Despite of the fact that all respondents felt that internationalization would be more important in the future (see Figure 2), only a few seemed to have specific policies or targets with the general conclusion that “more mobility, more agreements, more research” (Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 594). “In most cases, these plans had not been formalized or quantified, which would indicate a lack of effective strategy for the future” (Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 594).

	MPub1	MPub2	MPri1
Student mobility (exchanges and/or study abroad)	1	1	1
Staff mobility	N/A	2	1
International conference attendance/participation	N/A	N/A	1
International student recruitment	3	1	2
Recruitment of international staff	3	N/A	3
Collaborative international partnerships for research	1	N/A	1
Collaborative international partnerships for teaching	1	1	2
Membership of international networks or consortia	1	N/A	2

Figure 1 Types of Internationalization Activities: Internationalization activities currently undertaken.

Very important (1), important (2), not very important (3), not at all important (4), no response (N/A) (Source: Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 591)

	MPub1	MPub2	MPri1
Internationalisation will continue to be important	×	×	×
International student recruitment			×
Improvement in world rankings			
More student mobility	×	×	
More collaborative agreements	×		
More staff mobility	×		
To become a leading institution internationally		×	
To run Spanish courses for foreigners	×		
To involve incoming students in the local community		×	
To have more materials available in English			
To develop an online application system			
To develop customised programmes/short courses		×	

Figure 2 Future plans and priorities
(Source: Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 593)

From Motivation to Obligation

Rationales	Existing—National and Institutional Levels Combined
Social/cultural	National cultural identity Intercultural understanding Citizenship development Social and community development
Political	Foreign policy National security Technical assistance Peace and mutual understanding National identity Regional identity
Economic	Economic growth and competitiveness Labour market Financial incentives
Academic	International dimension to research and teaching Extension of academic horizon Institution building Profile and status Enhancement of quality International academic standards
Level	Of Emerging Importance— National and Institutional Levels Separated
National	Human resources development Strategic alliances Commercial trade Nation building Social/cultural development
Institutional	International branding and profile Income generation Student and staff development Strategic alliances Knowledge production

Figure 3 Rationales Driving Internationalization
(Source: Knight, 2004, p. 23)

Knight enumerated the traditional rationales driving internationalization dividing them into four groups: social/cultural, political, academic, and economic (see Figure 3). Knight writes that “given the increasing emphasis on competition at the international level, it is tempting to introduce a new category that recognizes the importance that institutions are giving to branding or developing a strong international reputation” (Knight, 2004, p. 22). Competition in achieving high academic standards has always been given importance; however, to meet the demands of globalization, a competitive international profile has become increasingly crucial to academic institutions. “Suffice it to say that institutions and providers are undertaking serious efforts to create an international reputation and name brand for their own institution or for a network/consortium to place them in a more desirable position for competitive advantage” (Knight, 2004, p. 22).

	MPub1	MPub2	MPri1
Government requirement			
Part of institutional identity/brand			
Improved career prospects for graduates			
Necessary to keep ahead/'everyone else is doing it'			×
To build institutional reputation/profile		×	×
Global citizenship/international awareness of students	×		×
To compete for international funds			×

Figure 4 Institutional motivation and perceived benefits
(Source: Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 592)

It seems as though internationalization was used to increase the institution's marketability rather than a tool to enhance the quality of education it provides. In the research conducted, "the improvement of academic quality was not mentioned as a motivation by the respondents," but academic rationales focused on developing an international reputation and building status for the institution (see Figure 4) (Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 594). Considering that the interviewees belonged to institutions that were regarded as the best in their respective countries, they may have been reluctant to admit to any deficiencies in the area (Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 594). As for other motivations that fall into the cultural, social, and economic groups, motivations such as "developing students' international awareness and helping them to become global citizens" (see Figure 4) and providing students with an international experience to give them an advantage when looking for a job (Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 595). According to an interviewee from a public university in Mexico, "a year abroad is a plus for their CV" (cited in Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 595).

There is a sense of internationalization being a necessary process for universities in the twenty-first century seeing that this the IoHE process has moved beyond motivation to an obligation (Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 596). Interviewees saw internationalization as a consequence of globalization in such a way that a higher importance was given to offering students with an international perspective in order to be more competitive in the job market (Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 596). Moreover, "students themselves put pressure on their university to internationalize by demanding more opportunities for outgoing mobility" due to the perception that "those who do not engage in internationalization will be left behind" (Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 596).

Conclusion

"All in all, the rationales driving internationalization vary from institution to institution, from government department to government department, from stakeholder to stakeholder, and from country to country" (Knight, 2004, p. 28). Due to the competitive demands of globalization, IoHE has become increasingly important. Educational institutions are starting to recognize the importance of producing global citizens aware of global issues and competent enough to compete in the growing global job market. The option to internationalize educational institutions has moved from being just an option to becoming an obligation that is well demanded by the staff and students as well as the educational institution itself.

Despite of the obstacles in place to realize the process of IoHE in Latin American countries such as Mexico, all the universities still aim to achieve IoHE. "All the universities stressed the importance of leadership through their Rector or their institution's strategic plan" (Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 592). The rector of the private university interviewed in the

research of Berry and Taylor “had established a strategic plan for the next 10 years which specified an increase in the international student population,” which means a massive change and the importance of leadership and vision was clear in shaping such change (Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 592). The rector of one of the public universities in the interview was also “committed to raising the University to become ‘world class’ and, to this end, had embarked upon an active policy of internationalization” (Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 592).

The important role of universities with regards “to sharing knowledge, offering students an international perspective in order to be more competitive in the job market, and understanding global citizenship” have increased in the world today (Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 596). The demand that globalization has placed in educational institutions have pushed these institutions to speed up and concretize the process of internationalization. Although the process of IoHE varies from country to country, it is clear that “each university had ‘a responsibility to relate what they do to what happens in the world’ (Berry & Taylor, 2013, p. 592).

Bibliography

1. Berry C. & Taylor J. (2014). Internationalisation in Higher Education in Latin America: Policies and Practice in Colombia and Mexico. Higher Education. May 2014; 67 (5): 585-601.

2. Egron-Polak, E., de Wit, H., Howard, L., & Hunter, F. (2015). Internationalization of Higher Education. European Parliament: Directorate General for Internal Policies: Structural and Cohesion Policies: Culture and Education.

3. International Association of Universities. (2014). 4th Global Survey: Internationalization of Higher Education - Growing expectations, fundamental values. Paris.

4. Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization Remodeled: Definition, Approaches, and Rationales. Journal of Studies in International Education. March 2004; 8: 5-31.

UDC 331.08

Armando V. Morales Cano,

student of Master degree program

“HR-management in international organization”,

Ural Federal University, Yekaterinburg, Russia,

Juarez University of Durango State, Durango, Mexico;

Gerardo S. Tovar,

student of Master degree program

“HR-management in international organization”,

Ural Federal University, Yekaterinburg, Russia,

Puebla University, Puebla, Mexico;

Konstantin M. Olkhovikov,

professor, Ural Federal University, Yekaterinburg, Russia

INTERVIEWING IN RUSSIA: UNDERSTANDING CULTURAL CONTEXTS

Abstract. General definition of interview as a research method is not problematic. The problems come with the applications of this type of survey. Any sustainable characteristic of the interviewing possibilities implies a wide range of cultural factors that become visible in the situation of cross-cultural interviewing. This article promotes educative and enlightening mission of such investigative practices in the context of international Master degree program in Ural Federal